

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

SAKINA ELLIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID KRUMP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C21-1001-RSM

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter comes before the Court sua sponte and on the Court's July 29, 2021 Order to Show Cause. Dkt. #5. Plaintiff Sakina Ellis, proceeding pro se, filed this action on July 27, 2021. Dkt. #1. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this matter. Dkt. #3. Summonses have not been issued.

Plaintiff brings this action under claims of federal stalking, 18 U.S.C. § 2261A, and federal cyberstalking, 18 U.S.C. § 875(c). Dkt. #4. Her civil cover sheet identifies several descriptions for the nature of the suit, including other contract, other personal injury, assault, libel & slander, personal injury - product liability, health care / pharmaceutical personal injury, other personal property damage, and violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Dkt. #1-2.

//

1 On July 29, 2021, the Court issued an order to show cause. Dkt. #5. The Court indicated  
2 that Plaintiff's complaint fails to connect any facts to the statute allegedly violated. *Id.* at 2.  
3 Likewise, her complaint does not support the various claims listed in her civil cover sheet with  
4 specific facts presented in a clear and understandable manner. *Id.* The statement of claim section  
5 is blank, and the two notes attached to the complaint do not clarify how the facts presented in  
6 this case could constitute violations of the cited statutes or causes of action.  
7

8 The Court ordered Plaintiff to respond with "a short and plain statement telling the Court  
9 (1) the separate causes of action upon which her claims are based, (2) how Defendants violated  
10 each of those laws causing harm to Plaintiff, and (3) why this case should not be dismissed  
11 without prejudice." *Id.* The Court further advised that "[f]ailure to file this Response will result  
12 in dismissal of this case." *Id.*  
13

14 As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has not filed a Response. Accordingly, the Court  
15 hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff's claims are DISMISSED. This matter is CLOSED.  
16

17  
18 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.  
19

20  
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28